

REMARKS

The pending Office Action addresses and rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 7-15, and 17-33.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 22 are amended to recite that a pressure sensor is disposed across an open proximal end of the catheter. Claim 29 is amended to remove the term “permanently” and to recite that a proximal pressure sensor is disposed across an open proximal end of the catheter. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in paragraph 0030 of the specification. Claims 24 and 30 are amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter is added.

Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 29-33 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that claim 29 is unclear as there is insufficient support in the specification for the second lumen being permanently sealed. Claim 29 is amended as noted above to remove the term “permanently,” thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

(1) Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 15, 17, 18, 21-24, and 28-29

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 15, 17, 18, 21-24, and 28-29 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,497 of Wallace et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,928,693 of Goodin.

Wallace does not teach or suggest a pressure sensor disposed across an open proximal end of a catheter, as required by independent claims 1, 22, and 29. Wallace is directed to a device for taking pressure measurements in the uterus that includes a balloon 342 that is inserted into the uterus and that is charged with air via a lumen 330 to a known pressure. A proximal end of the device includes a housing

which is designed to be coupled to a reusable interface cable assembly (84). The cable assembly includes a pressure detection device (94) which houses a sensor (102). Thus, the sensor is not disposed within the catheter, let alone disposed across an open proximal end of the catheter.

Goodin does not remedy the deficiencies of Wallace as Goodin does not teach a pressure sensor disposed across an open proximal end of the catheter. Rather, Goodin teaches that the proximal end of the catheter is connected to a plastic hub that connects to a module for reading and recording pressure readings. (See Col 3, lines 36-39 of Goodin).

Claims 1, 22, and 29, as well as claims 3, 4, 8-10, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, and 28 which depend therefrom, therefore distinguish over Wallace and Goodin and represent allowable subject matter.

(2) Claims 7, 11-13, 19, 20, 25-27, 31-33

Claims 7, 11-13, 19, 20, 25-27, and 31-33 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Wallace and Goodin in view of various references set forth in the Office Action. The Examiner relies on these references to teach various features recited in the dependent claims and not taught by Wallace and Goodin. As indicated above, the combination of Wallace and Goodin does not teach the claimed invention. The various secondary references cited by the Examiner do not remedy the deficiencies of Wallace and Goodin. Accordingly, claims 7, 11-13, 19, 20, 25-27, and 31-33 distinguish over Wallace, Goodin, and the various secondary references and represent allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicants if such communication is deemed to expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2008

/Lisa Adams/
Lisa Adams, Reg. No. 44,238
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210
Tel: (617)439-2550
Fax: (617)310-9550

1727445.1